

Application Serial No: 10/774,642  
In reply to Office Action of 10 November 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83651

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application. No claims are allowed. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12 and 15-18 are rejected and claims 7, 8, 11, 13 and 14 are objected to. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12 and 15-18 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 7, 11 and 13 are amended by this action.

In the Office Action, claim 13 was objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 13 does not end with a period, and is thus possibly incomplete. Appropriate correction is required.

In the Office Action, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (reference E: U.S. Patent No. 3,191,572) in view of Rizzo (reference C: U.S. Patent No. 4,393,802).

The Office Action states that Wilson discloses a multi-hull surface vessel, as shown in Figures 1-6, that is comprised of a main hull, defined as Part #12, at least two lateral hulls, defined as Parts #11 and 13, that are disposed on opposite sides of said main hull with a surface deck, as shown in Figure 1, disposed therebetween, a means for generating power for said vessel in the form of an engine, defined as Part M, and a means for reducing drag on said lateral hulls in the form of a plurality of openings, defined as Parts #28, 29 and 30, for

Application Serial No: 10/774,642  
In reply to Office Action of 10 November 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83651

introducing air bubbles under pressure beneath said hulls of said vessel.

The Office Action further states that Wilson, as set forth above, discloses all of the features claimed except for the use of a means for reducing drag on a hull in relation to a power generating means.

The Office Action still further states Rizzo discloses a vessel, as shown in Figures 1-10, that is comprised of a hull, defined as Part #12, a means for generating power in the form of an engine, defined as Part #61, and a means for reducing drag on said hull in the form of a plurality of conduits, defined as Parts #66, 68, 70, 72, 74 and 76, that connect said engine with a plurality of exhaust ports, defined as Parts #18, 20, 22, 24, 62 and 64, in order to direct exhaust from said engine beneath said hull.

Therefore, as the Office Action states, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to utilize a means for reducing drag on a hull in relation to a power generating means, as taught by Rizzo, in combination with the multi-hull vessel as disclosed by Wilson for the purpose of providing a multi-hull vessel with a means for reducing drag on a pair of lateral hulls by introducing exhaust gas directed from an engine beneath said hulls.

Application Serial No: 10/774,642  
In reply to Office Action of 10 November 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83651

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Rizzo, and further in view of Takahashi et al. (reference B: U.S. Patent No. 6,092,480).

The Office Action states that Wilson in combination with the teachings of Rizzo shows all of the features claimed except for the use of a plurality of microbubble injectors that are disposed on subsurface areas of said hulls of said vessel.

The Office Action further states that Takahashi et al. discloses a vessel, as shown in Figures 3 and 6, that includes a plurality of microbubble injectors, defined as Part #6 or 13, that are disposed on subsurface areas of the hull of said vessel in order to reduce skin-friction on the hull of said vessel.

Therefore, as the Office Action states, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to utilize a plurality of microbubble injectors disposed on subsurface areas of a hull of a vessel, as taught by Takahashi et al., in combination with the multi-hull vessel as disclosed by Wilson and the teachings of Rizzo for the purpose of providing a multi-hull vessel with a means for reducing drag on a pair of lateral hulls by introducing microbubbles of exhaust gas directed from an engine beneath said hulls.

The Office Action has objected to claims 7, 8, 11, 13 and 14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

Application Serial No: 10/774,642  
In reply to Office Action of 10 November 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83651

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

These rejections and objections are respectfully traversed in view of these amendments and remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 13 of the present application was objected to as not ending with a period. In response, claim 13 has been amended to add a period at the end of the claim; therefore, the objection of the Office Action is resolved.

In the Office Action, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (reference E: U.S. Patent No. 3,191,572) in view of Rizzo (reference C: U.S. Patent No. 4,393,802). In response, claim 18 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and therefore the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for this claim.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson in view of Rizzo, and further in view of Takahashi et al. (reference B: U.S. Patent No. 6,092,480). In response, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12 and 15-17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and therefore the rejection of the Office Action is resolved for these claims.

The Office Action has objected to claims 7, 8, 11, 13 and 14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

Application Serial No: 10/774,642  
In reply to Office Action of 10 November 2004

Attorney Docket No. 83651

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claims 7, 11 and 13 have been amended into independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8 and 14 remain originally written as dependant on respective amended claims 7 and 13.

In view of the amendment above and the claims therein, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Michael P. Stanley, Attorney for Applicants, at 401-832-4736 if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a telephone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of the subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,  
ROBERT G. LATORRE ET AL

7 February 2005

By   
MICHAEL P. STANLEY  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No. 47108